

## REMARKS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on April 2, 2008. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1-5, 25, and 27-32 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicants have: 1) amended claims 1 and 27; and 2) added claims 33-34. As such, claims 1-5, 25, and 27-34 are now pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now represented.

### Claim Rejections

#### 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-3, 25, 27-29, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biebesheimer, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0107843 in (hereinafter "Biebesheimer") in view of Piersol, U.S. Patent Number 6,978,297 (hereinafter "Piersol"). The action listed claims 26-29 as being unpatentable based on the above combination, but claim 26 has been cancelled and the Office Action provides a rejection for claim 25; thus, the Applicants respond in kind.

Biebesheimer relates to a customer self service system that performs resource search and selection. In other words, a customer enters a query to search for relevant resources in a database. (*See, e.g.*, Abstract). For example, a customer may query "plan a trip to Vermont in June" to search for resources available in a database. (*See, e.g.*, Figure 3). More specifically, Biebesheimer discloses a mechanism for classifying user contexts for facilitating a more focused search and improving the relevance of query results for such a system. (¶ 0002).

A user context, as defined by Biebesheimer, represents a predefined set of context attributes which are relevant to the search behavior/needs of a group of people. (¶ 0050). For example, in Figure 3, with respect to the "travel" domain and the exemplary search query stated above ("plan a trip to Vermont in June"), various user contexts may be available-"single mom w/ kids," "swinging singles,"

and "business traveler"-thus, helping to focus the search (Figure 3). The search may be further focused via various context attributes such as 'mode of transportation', "mode of housing", or "food style." Additionally, resource parameters-such as "include all major carriers"-help focus the query.

The system provides a three part iconic interface for visualizing and exploring the set of resources that the system has found to match the user's initial query and related subject and context variables. (§ 0027). Via these interface components 12, 22,32, the user may (re-)define their query, preview some or all of the suggested resources or further reduce, and redisplay the response set to extract those with the best degree of fit with that user's current needs. (§ 0027).

Furthermore, the system stores the users' prior queries, responses, and interactions with the system, with the intention of improving search results. For example, the system retains adjustments made to the user context, manipulations to the displayed results, and viewing results and selection behavior. (§ 0045).

Piersol relates to an electronic document management system that performs electronic document capture, indexing, and searching within a network environment. (See, e.g., Abstract) Document capture occurs when a first device requests a second, archiving, device to store a copy of a document. (Col. 5, ll. 58-60) For example, "A print job created on client **110** and intended for printer **130** could be captured, for example, as a thumbnail image, a postscript file, a portable format (PDF) and an ASCII file containing extracted text." (Col. 6, ll. 3-7)

As documents are sent through a computer network, devices can request that the file management appliance (abbreviated as FMA in Piersol) system capture the documents. (Col. 1, l. 65 – Col. 2, l. 7) In some cases, documents are "transparently (e.g., unbeknownst to the device) captured and at least part of the data is routed to FMA **150** for indexing." (Col. 6, ll. 36-38) As the documents are captured, "each document captured within an FMA system is stored on the FMA as a separate UNIX directory that includes a metadata file." (Col. 8, ll. 49-51) Then, "through the FMA web interface, a user is able to search for and

retrieve documents that have been captured by the FMA. In one embodiment, the FMA utilizes metadata attributes . . . to enable integrated retrieval of captured documents using both time oriented and content oriented queries.” (Col. 11, ll. 31-36)

The combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol describes a document management system that performs document capture, indexing, and searching within a network environment. The system allows devices to request the FMA system to store a copy of a document. The system stores copies of documents as separate UNIX directories that includes a file containing metadata. Once the documents are captured, the system allows the user to search for documents using metadata attributes.

The system further provides a mechanism for classifying user contexts for facilitating a more focused search and improving the relevance of query results for such a system. This system stores each users’ prior search queries, results, and interactions to improve the results provided in future searches.

#### Claim 1

The combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol does not describe what claims 1 requires (emphasis added):

1. A method comprising:

presenting a graphical user interface (GUI) for a capture system, wherein the GUI comprises one or more views including:

a search editor view to enable parameters of a search of tags of objects captured by the capture system to be defined, *the capture system to intercept data from data streams, reconstruct network transmitted objects, and store network transmitted objects according to a capture rule*, wherein each tag is associated with at least one captured object and includes relevant information that describes the at least one object; and

*a capture rule view to enable parameters of the capture rule to be defined.*

First, the combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol does not “intercept data from data streams, reconstruct network transmitted objects, and store network transmitted object according to a capture rule.” Reconstructing network transmitted objects is not the same as merely capturing documents as performed in the Piersol system. (Col. 5, ll. 58-64) Therefore, the combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol does not render claim 1 obvious for this reason, and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is in a condition for allowance.

Second, the combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol does not describe “a capture rule view to enable parameters of the capture rule to be defined.” The parameters discussed in paragraph 65 of Biebesheimer, cited in the Office Action, are not parameters of a capture rule. They have nothing do with capturing and storing network transmitted objects. Rather, these parameters pertain to the search query performed on a database that does not contain captured objects. Moreover, as Biebesheimer does not even capture objects Biebesheimer cannot describe a view that enables parameters of a rule to capture objects to be defined. Piersol describes, “in one embodiment, document capture is automatically performed upon all documents within an FMA system, whereas in another embodiment, only selected documents are captured in response to a user setting. For example, *the user may press a button that prevents documents from being automatically captured.*” (Col. 9, ll. 43-47 (emphasis added)) Piersol describes a system in which all documents are captured and allows a user to prevent the automatic capture with the push of a button. This all or nothing automatic capture does not describe a view that enables *parameters* of a rule to capture objects to be defined.

Therefore, the combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol does not render claim 1 obvious for this reason as well, and thus Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is in a condition for allowance.

#### Claims 2, 3, and 25

Claims 2, 3, and 25 ultimately depend from independent claim 1 and thus include all the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits

that claims 2, 3, and 25 are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as claim 1.

Claim 27

The combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol does not describe what claims 27 requires (emphasis added):

27. A computer readable medium having stored thereon data representing instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising:
- presenting a graphical user interface (GUI) for a capture system, wherein the GUI comprises one or more views including:
    - a search editor view to enable parameters of a search of tags of objects captured by the capture system to be defined, *the capture system to intercept data from data streams, reconstruct network transmitted objects, and store network transmitted objects according to a capture rule*, wherein each tag is associated with at least one captured object and includes relevant information that describes the at least one object;
    - a capture rule view to enable parameters of the capture rule to be defined.

First, the combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol does not “intercept data from data streams, reconstruct network transmitted objects, and store network transmitted object according to a capture rule.” Reconstructing network transmitted objects is not the same as merely capturing documents as performed in the Piersol system. (Col. 5, ll. 58-64) Therefore, the combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol does not render claim 27 obvious for this reason, and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 27 is in a condition for allowance.

Second, the combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol does not describe “a capture rule view to enable parameters of the capture rule to be defined.” The parameters discussed in paragraph 65 of Biebesheimer, cited in the Office Action, are not parameters of a capture rule. They have nothing to do with capturing and storing network transmitted objects. Rather, these parameters pertain to the search query performed on a database that does not contain captured objects. Moreover, as Biebesheimer does not even capture objects

Biebesheimer cannot describe a view that enables parameters of a rule to capture objects to be defined. Piersol describes, “in one embodiment, document capture is automatically performed upon all documents within an FMA system, whereas in another embodiment, only selected documents are captured in response to a user setting. For example, *the user may press a button that prevents documents from being automatically captured.*” (Col. 9, ll. 43-47 (emphasis added)) Piersol describes a system in which all documents are captured and allows a user to prevent the automatic capture with the push of a button. This all or nothing automatic capture does not describe a view that enables *parameters* of a rule to capture objects to be defined.

Therefore, the combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol does not render claim 27 obvious for this reason as well, and thus Applicants respectfully submit that claim 27 is in a condition for allowance.

#### Claims 28, 29, and 32

Claims 28, 29, and 32 ultimately depend from independent claim 27 and thus include all the limitations of claim 27. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 28, 29, and 32 are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as claim 27.

#### 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claims 4 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biebesheimer, in view of Piersol and further in view of Kahn, U.S. Patent Number 7,185,192 (hereinafter “Kahn”).

#### Claim 4

Claim 4 ultimately depends from claim 1 and includes all the limitations of claim 1. The addition of the Kahn reference adds nothing to the combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol that would render claim 1 obvious. Therefore, as discussed above, claim 4 is allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1.

#### Claim 30

Claim 30 ultimately depends from claim 27 and includes all the limitations fo claim 27. The addition of the Kahn reference adds nothing to the combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol that would render claim 27 obvious. Therefore, as discussed above, claim 30 is allowable for at least the same reason as claim 27.

#### 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claims 5 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biebesheimer, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0107843 in (hereinafter "Biebesheimer") in view of Microsoft Outlook 2000 © 1995-2000, (hereinafter "Outlook").

#### Claim 5

Claim 5 ultimately depends from claim 1 and includes all the limitations fo claim 1. The addition of the Outlook reference adds nothing to the combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol that would render claim 1 obvious. Therefore, as discussed above, claim 5 is allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1.

#### Claim 31

Claim 31 ultimately depends from claim 27 and includes all the limitations fo claim 27. The addition of the Outlook reference adds nothing to the combination of Biebesheimer and Piersol that would render claim 27 obvious. Therefore, as discussed above, claim 31 is allowable for at least the same reason as claim 27.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Ryan W. Elliott at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 8/4/08

/Ryan W. Elliott/  
Ryan W. Elliott  
Reg. No.: 60,156

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
(408) 720-8300